

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,813	09/15/2003	Sankar Dasgupta	P63902	7391
22839 7590 03/07/2007 RICHES, MCKENZIE & HERBERT, LLP SUITE 1800			EXAMINER BERHANE, ADOLF D	
2 BLOOR STREET EAST TORONTO, ON M4W 3J5			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CANADA			2838	
				-
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/07/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		K				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commons	10/661,813	DASGUPTA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Adolf Berhane	2838				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/16/	<b>/07</b> .					
	action is non-final.					
•						
closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims	•					
4) Claim(s) 52-58 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) <u>52-58</u> is/are rejected.	•					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)		•				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	•				

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 52-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King (6,331,365).

King discloses the claimed invention except for the optimum range. King discloses a traction motor drive system in Figs. 2-7. A motor drive system with a first rechargeable battery (24) and a second rechargeable battery (48), boost converter (34) to boost the voltage available from the rechargeable battery (24), the first rechargeable battery has a higher impedance than the second rechargeable battery (col. 1, line 40), the electrical energy stored in the energy battery drive the motor, the second rechargeable battery is recharged by the first rechargeable battery (col. 5, line 21) via a controller having a switch (40), the first rechargeable battery can be a lithium-ion battery (col. 6, line 64) and the secondary rechargeable can be a lead acid battery (col. 1, line 36). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the optimum range, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Application/Control Number: 10/661,813

Art Unit: 2838

## Response to Arguments

Page 3

3. Applicant's arguments filed 2/17/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to Applicant argues that the two battery are not connected in parallel, Applicants attention is directed to Fig. 4 which shows the first rechargeable battery (24) connected in parallel to the second rechargeable battery (48). The Boost converter does not open or close the parallel connection between the two batteries. Applicant's argument that the diode 26 of King acts as a switch and disconnects the parallel connection under operating conditions is incorrect. Applicant points to King at col. 3, lines 40-45 which states "For this reasons, a unidirectional conductor shown for example as a diode 26 is connected in positive bus of the DC line 14 between the mechanically rechargeable battery 24 and the inverter 18 so as to preclude power flow to the mechanically battery". First of all the power normally flows from the battery to the inverter, the diode is just to block the reverse power flow to the battery. Therefore the diode doesn't act as a switch.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adolf Berhane whose telephone number is 571-272-2077. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 8 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Karl Easthom can be reached on 571-272-1989. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/661,813

Art Unit: 2838

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Adolf Berhane Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2838